



# DRAFT MINUTES

## **Community Advisory Committee**

Wednesday, May 22, 2024

### **1. Committee Meeting Call to Order**

Chair Siegal called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m.

CAC members present at Roll: Rosa Chen, Phoebe Ford, Sean Kim, Jerry Levine, Venecia Margarita, Austin Milford-Rosales, Rachael Ortega, and Kat Siegal (8)

CAC Members Absent at Roll: Sara Barz, Najuwanda Daniels, and Mariko Davidson (entered during Item 6) (3)

### **2. Chair's Report – INFORMATION**

Chair Siegal announced positive news from the Governor's Budget Revisé released on May 10 which preserved most of the transportation funding in the budget including Assembly Bill 102 and Senate Bill (SB) 125 funds – transit funding intended to support operators facing deficits this year. Chair Siegal stated the action would preserve statewide funding for transit, including \$1.1 billion slated for Bay Area operators. She continued that it was critical 'bridge' funding for transit providing time for the region to find a more stable source of funding such as Senate Bill 1031.

Chair Siegal announced that, to explore new revenue sources, Caltrans was launching a 6-month pilot program in June which would evaluate charging drivers based on the number of miles they drove as potential replacement for California's gas tax, which had become a less robust funding source as electric vehicles became more prevalent. The program, called the California Road Charge, was seeking volunteers, who would earn up to \$400, for agreeing to have their mileage recorded. She said that ultimately the state legislature would have to approve a road user charge and interested parties could find more information at [CARoadcharge.com](http://CARoadcharge.com) for more details.

Chair Siegal highlighted a public engagement opportunity connected to the District 2 Safety Study, requested by Commissioner Catherine Stefani, and funded through the Neighborhood Program. The study aims to design and implement quick-build treatments for six locations throughout the district that prioritized vulnerable travelers, such as seniors and children. Chair Siegal reported that the purpose of the first outreach round was to collect community input on priority locations to receive safety improvements and said that the study team launched an online survey and would hold pop-up engagement events throughout the months of May and June, including one at the Presidio Branch Library on Thursday, May 30, from 12pm to 2pm and a virtual Town Hall on Thursday June 13. The Chair concluded by stating that interested parties could take the survey and get more information at [sfcta.org/d2safety](http://sfcta.org/d2safety).

There was no public comment.



## Consent Agenda

3. **Approve the Minutes of the April 24, 2024 Meeting – ACTION**
4. **Internal Accounting Report, Investment Report, and Debt Expenditure Report for the Nine Months Ending March 31, 2024 – INFORMATION**
5. **State and Federal Legislation Update – INFORMATION**

There was no public comment.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC members Chen, Ford, Kim, Levine, Margarita, Milford-Rosales, Ortega, and Siegal (8)

Absent: CAC members Barz, Daniels, and Davidson (3)

## End of Consent Agenda

6. **Adopt a Motion of Support to Adopt the 2023 Prop L 5-Year Prioritization Programs for Mission Bay Ferry Landing and Transformative Freeway and Major Street Projects and Amend the Prop L Strategic Plan Baseline - ACTION**

Amelia Walley, Program Analyst, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Levine noted that University of California, San Francisco, (UCSF) was near the site of the future ferry landing and asked if UCSF was contributing to the funding plan, suggesting they should.

Ms. Walley answered that they were not listed on the funding plan.

Shannon Cairns, Port of San Francisco Project Manager, added that although she could not say that UCSF had contributed monetarily, they had provided support in pursuing funding.

Member Levine commented that it seemed UCSF was benefiting from the project without having to contribute and that the project should not have to be publicly funded.

Member Ford asked if the Chase Center contributed funding to the project and noted that community support and benefits to the community for the project seemed low, relative to the Fillmore-Geary Underpass project. She asked if the project was still relevant and what were the specifications for operation of ferry service for the terminal, given that other ferry services were not financially viable at the time.

Ms. Cairns responded that the project had been ongoing for a long time with changed conditions since the pandemic, with San Francisco Water Emergency Transportation Authority (WETA) as the primary but not exclusive operator. She added that WETA was a close partner in their application for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Clean Ports grant, with Mission Bay Ferry Landing as an important part of working toward electrifying WETA's fleet, along with contribution to the viability of all-electronic operation on the Bay. She also remarked that the improved ferry service would benefit disadvantaged communities regionally, not just ones that



were in the immediate vicinity of the terminal. She said that she or someone from WETA could follow up about ferry operations at the Mission Bay terminal.

Member Ford asked if WETA had committed to serving the terminal when it opened.

Ms. Cairns affirmed.

There was no public comment.

Member Margarita moved to approve the item, seconded by Member Milford-Rosales.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC members Chen, Davidson, Kim, Margarita, Milford-Rosales, Ortega, and Siegal (7)

Abstain: CAC members Ford and Levine (2)

Absent: CAC members Barz and Daniels (2)

**7. Adopt a Motion of Support to Appropriate \$601,000 in Prop L Funds, with Conditions, and Approve Memorandum of Agreements with the San Francisco Planning Department in an Amount Not to Exceed \$150,000, and with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency in an Amount Not to Exceed \$190,800 for the Fillmore-Geary Underpass Community Planning Study – ACTION**

Rachel Hiatt, Deputy Director for Planning, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Chair Siegel expressed support and asked about the consideration for displaced people no longer in community groups so they could participate in outreach.

Ms. Hiatt responded that it was an issue that staff had been discussing. She mentioned reaching Black, Jewish, and Japanese individuals who had moved out of the area and seeking participation from community groups that had historical ties to the neighborhood. She also mentioned plans to encourage those individuals to participate on the community advisory board.

Member Levine expressed support and asked how long it would take for the project to be constructed.

Ms. Hiatt replied that it depended on the project or projects that may be recommended through the study. She said that considerations would range from refilling the underpass to non-construction work. She also mentioned that the team was prepared to analyze the engineering feasibility and funding pathway for major construction projects but could not presume the outcome. She commented the filling of the underpass would take a number of years.

Member Davidson asked if the connecting communities grant prioritized connecting communities without cars.

Ms. Hiatt replied that the grant aimed to correct harms caused by car-oriented roadways. She added that this funding was meant to rebalance community vibrancy lost to auto infrastructure.



Member Ortega asked about the relative feasibility and cost of tunnels compared to the filling option. She said she could receive an answer by email on the cost of tunnels and other options.

Ms. Hiatt responded that there was a large budget for the planning study and that the grant provided resources for engineering work. She said staff anticipated there would be big engineering ideas as the study provided resources to look at significant ideas. She added that during the engineering phase staff would let the community know about costs and opportunities for bold ideas.

During public comment, Edward Mason asked if Link21 or the Geary subway were part of consideration for the project. He commented that future projects in 20 or 30 years would undo this effort. He said the Planning Department indicated this would be a redevelopment project, so he wanted to know how this plan related to the community-oriented statements. He also asked for the consideration of water, sewage, and electricity needs to support development.

Member Levine moved to approve the item, seconded by Member Ortega.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC members Chen, Davidson, Ford, Levine, Kim, Margarita, Milford-Rosales, Ortega, and Siegal (9)

Absent: CAC members Barz and Daniels (2)

**8. Adopt a Motion of Support to Allocate \$49,510,637 in Prop L Funds and \$2,460,572 in Prop AA Funds, with Conditions, for 11 Requests - ACTION**

Lynda Viray, Transportation Planner; Amelia Walley, Program Analyst; Nick Smith, Senior Transportation Planner; and Damon Curtis, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) Traffic Calming Program Manager, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Margarita asked about the criteria used to select schools for school walk audits; specifically about what enrollment data was used and if student absences would impact the data and schools' score on this criterion.

Mr. Curtis responded that the SFMTA received enrollment data directly from the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD). He stated that the data was collected throughout the year and first made available in October, and that the SFMTA would use the data from the coming October to prioritize schools for walk audits. He stated that low enrollment would not necessarily preclude a school from qualifying for the program, as there were other considerations in prioritizing schools, including collisions within a quarter mile of the school, which would be weighted more heavily than enrollment, and the number of children living within walking distance of a school.

Member Margarita commented that some low-income students have to miss school in order to work and asked that the SFMTA consider low-income, no-income, multilingual, and multi-ethnic children who may not be represented in school enrollment data.

Member Levine asked which manufacturer would produce the 40-foot hybrid motor coaches.



Gary Chang, SFMTA Senior Engineer, responded that New Flyer was the manufacturer SFMTA was currently working with for hybrid motor coaches.

Member Levine asked when the first new vehicles would be put into service.

Mr. Chang responded that the first buses would be delivered in April or May 2025, with deliveries continuing until September 2026.

Member Milford-Rosales asked about coordination with the Port of San Francisco on the Central Embarcadero Safety project, and if there were plans to expand the two-way bikeway beyond its current location.

Casey Hildreth, SFMTA Program Manager, responded that the SFMTA and Port of San Francisco discussed that the Central Embarcadero Safety project currently proposed would not be ripped up in the near-term and would be in alignment with long-term visions for the corridor. He stated that the SFMTA was focused on extending the bikeway as far south as possible. He continued that, on the northern side, a two-way bikeway north of Broadway did not fit under current conditions, and that further planning work was needed to determine the future of the northern section of the corridor.

Member Milford-Rosales commented that the two-way bikeway often became unrideable in high traffic due to obstructions from people opening their car doors into the bikeway or vendors in the bikeway, and that the cross streets were difficult to navigate in the southbound direction. He expressed support for extending and protecting the two-way bikeway.

Member Kim asked how many contractors there were and who was the current contractor for the Safe Routes to School project.

Ben Frazer, SFMTA Program Coordinator, responded that there were several contractors who provided specialized services for the Safe Routes to School program, with the primary contractor being the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition. He said other contractors included Walk San Francisco, San Francisco Transit Riders, communications consultant Contigo, and program evaluation consultant Cause IMPACTS.

Member Kim asked if it was ethically appropriate for the SFMTA to hire the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition (SFBC), given that one of SFBC's functions was lobbying.

Mr. Frazer responded that SFBC comprised two different institutions and that the SFMTA worked only with the Bicycle Education Program, which focused exclusively on educational programs and had its own board of directors. He stated that there was financial and operational separation between the education program and SFBC's advocacy work.

Chair Siegal asked what the anticipated useful life of the battery electric buses would be, and if vehicles from the first procurement would continue to be used.

Bhavin Khatri, SFMTA Senior Engineer, responded that the battery electric buses were not part of the pilot program and were instead replacement vehicles for retiring hybrid buses. He stated that their useful life was 12 years and that SFMTA would continue to operate the 12 pilot vehicles until the end of their useful life.

Chair Siegal asked if all the buses were compatible with the same charging



infrastructure.

Mr. Khatri affirmed that the buses from the five different manufacturers could work on the same type of chargers.

Chair Siegal asked if SFMTA planned to continue procuring buses from multiple manufacturers, or if they planned to choose one to continue working with.

Mr. Khatri responded that SFMTA intended to move forward with procuring vehicles from multiple manufacturers for healthy competition.

Chair Siegal asked if SFMTA was considering other proactive safety improvements in addition to daylighting for the Safe Routes to School program, such as raised crosswalk or bulb-outs.

Mr. Curtis responded that daylighting was the only proactive safety measure included in the Safe Routes to School program, but added that walk audits could identify other improvements, including raised crosswalks, speed humps, and signal timing changes.

Member Margarita asked if SFMTA would consider changing the enrollment criterion for the school walk audit program to consider population characteristics, including low-income and no-income children and multiethnic populations.

Mr. Curtis responded that SFMTA received enrollment data from SFUSD and had no control over its collection. He added that based on the program guidelines, the SFMTA used enrollment data, collision data, and the number of kids within a radius of the school to form a preliminary list of school candidates. He said this list was then refined in conversation with other program partners, taking into consideration recent or planned infrastructure projects, and prioritizing schools in Equity Priority Communities or California Communities of Concern. He added that the selection of each year's 10 schools for the program had to consider both socioeconomic equity and geographic equity to equally cover the 11 supervisorial districts.

Bryant Woo, SFMTA Program Manager, commented that he was the original founder of the Proactive School Traffic Calming Program in 2016, and explained that the original selection process used in the program had multiplied schools' enrollment by the number of collisions within a radius of the school. He stated that these criteria were used because the SFMTA wanted to target every single school based on safety so that locations of greatest need would be addressed, regardless of the demographics of the neighborhood or students. He stated that the program had successfully managed to implement safety improvements at every single school in the city.

During public comment, Edward Mason expressed concern about sidewalks cracking soon after construction and the ability of workforces to adapt to technological innovations in electric vehicles, particularly for SFMTA's battery electric bus initiative.

Member Milford-Rosales moved to approve the item, seconded by Member Ortega.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC members Chen, Davidson, Ford, Levine, Kim, Margarita, Milford-Rosales, Ortega, and Siegal (9)

Absent: CAC members Barz and Daniels (2)



**9. Adopt a Motion of Support to Adopt the Proposed Fiscal Year 2024/25 Budget and Work Program - ACTION**

Cynthia Fong, Deputy Director for Finance & Administration, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun requested that either the Transportation Authority Board or the CAC re-evaluate the annual operating contribution to Caltrain funding, as it vanished following the passage of regional Measure RR.

Member Levine moved to approve the item, seconded by Member Milford-Rosales.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC members Chen, Davidson, Ford, Levine, Kim, Margarita, Milford-Rosales, Ortega, and Siegal (9)

Absent: CAC members Barz and Daniels (2)

**10. Adopt a Motion of Support to Approve Revised Administrative Code, Debt and Fiscal Policies; and Ratified Investment Policy - ACTION**

Cynthia Fong, Deputy Director for Finance & Administration, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Chair Siegal asked for verification if there were still any active subcommittees which may be impacted by the policy changes

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, affirmed there were none.

There was no public comment.

Member Ford moved to approve the item, seconded by Member Ortega.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC members Chen, Davidson, Ford, Levine, Kim, Margarita, Milford-Rosales, Ortega, and Siegal (9)

Absent: CAC members Barz and Daniels (2)

**11. Senate Bill 1031 (Wiener, Wahab) Connect Bay Area Act - INFORMATION/ACTION**

Martin Reyes, Principal Transportation Planner, presented the item.

Member Ford asked for clarification if State Route 37 (SR-37) would qualify for the funding and a reminder of MTC's role.

Mr. Reyes responded that there appeared to be quite a bit of support among Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) commissioners and advocates for ensuring that SR-37 would be eligible for regional measure funding, since they felt it a priority from a climate resilience perspective. He added that there were no named projects in the bill at this time.

Chief Deputy Maria Lombardo described the MTC's role as being similar to the Transportation Authority's plan, fund, and deliver roles but for the nine Bay Area counties.



Member Ford asked for clarification regarding how Marin and Sonoma counties would be allowed funding in a regional measure they could not vote on.

Mr. Reyes explained that Marin and Sonoma counties could only participate in a regional measure starting in 2028, which was intended to avoid having a competing Sonoma-Marín Area Rail Transit (SMART) measure and regional measure on the same ballot. Ms. Lombardo said her read of the current bill language indicated that Marin and Sonoma would only receive funding if the two counties participated in a ballot measure and that measure was approved by the voters..

Member Ortega asked for information on the impacts of the new return to source provisions and what the phrase "climate-neutral" means.

Mr. Reyes explained the concept of return to source and how a high return to source requirement may limit a measure's ability to address major transit operating shortfalls in the region.

Ms. Lombardo added that MTC would have reduced flexibility to address transit operating shortfalls in the most recent version of the bill as compared to the previous version due to the higher return to source threshold. She also explained that "climate-neutral" projects was intended to include improvements to mitigate any environmental impacts, but the term was not further defined in the bill.

Member Davidson expressed concerns about the current commuter benefit ordinance language, particularly the lower amount of the subsidy provided for bicycle commuters. She added that if taking single occupancy vehicles off the street and protecting vulnerable users was a concern, the state should prioritize and give employers the option to fund all forms of non-vehicular commuting to each employee.

Mr. Reyes responded that Transportation Authority staff had provided input regarding increasing the bicycle subsidy.

Member Davidson made a motion to support seeking an amendment for the bill that would increase the subsidy for commuting by bike in the transportation demand management ordinance and adjust the subsidy regularly for inflation.

Member Ford asked if the bill included considerations for intercounty bike network improvements and whether MTC was the only agency that could facilitate raising revenues for transit.

Mr. Reyes responded that active transportation projects were eligible under certain funding categories in the bill. With respect to raising revenues for transit, he said that there were other agencies who could raise funding for transit, including transit districts.

Ms. Lombardo added that while intercounty bike network improvements were eligible, a high return to source requirement in the bill would mean that the relevant jurisdictions and MTC would need to work together to prioritize those improvements.

Member Margarita asked for more information about how transit services would be impacted if the bill did not pass and how dire was the regional deficit.

Mr. Reyes explained that multiple transit operators across the Bay Area were anticipated to experience operating budget deficits of several hundreds of millions of





dollars over the next few years, which could result in transit service reductions if not addressed.

Ms. Lombardo added that it would be easier for bus operators to shrink or reduce services as compared to rail operators that have a lot of fixed costs that would be incurred regardless of how much service is provided. She also reminded the CAC of the advocacy underway to keep the near-term state transit operating relief funds in the budget, which were intended to keep transit services operating in the near-term while long-term solutions such as SB 1031 were being developed.

Chair Siegal asked if there were any restrictions on expending funding for highway capacity projects.

Mr. Reyes responded that the only relevant language in the bill at present would require that highway projects be done in a 'climate-neutral' manner. He added that the expectation was that much of the eligibility criteria would be developed as part of an expenditure plan rather than in SB 1031. He then explained the percentage of funding in a measure that would go to various categories and what kinds of projects would be eligible under each category as described in SB 1031.

Member Milford-Rosales asked based on the legislative amendments if most of the funding in the bill would go towards non-transit uses.

Mr. Reyes responded that there was less funding available directly for transit fiscal cliff in the bill as compared to prior versions of the bill.

During public comment, Edward Mason commented on the lack of regional express bus lines included in the legislation.

Roland Lebrun said the bill was overly complicated and stated that he supported splitting the funding and consolidation aspects into two different bills.

After public comment, Chair Siegal proposed a friendly amendment to Member Davidson's proposed motion to seek amendments to make highway related projects ineligible for funding, saying that there were other sources of revenue for highway projects and citing the importance of focusing on transit.

Member Davidson accepted the amendment to the proposed motion.

Member Davidson moved to urge the Transportation Authority to seek amendments to SB 1031 to increase the bike commute subsidy and to allow it to increase with inflation and to make highway related projects ineligible for funding, seconded by Member Milford-Rosales.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC members Chen, Davidson, Ford, Levine, Margarita, Milford-Rosales, Ortega, and Siegal (8)

Absent: CAC members Barz, Daniels, and Kim, (3)

## **Other Items**

### **12. Introduction of New Business - INFORMATION**

Member Levine requested a report about the number of human-operated vehicles



and autonomous vehicles currently on the road, as well as collisions and citations issued in the past year in San Francisco on those vehicles. He added that autonomous vehicles seemed to be creating more congestion than they were relieving.

During public comment, Edward Mason supported Member Levine's remarks.

Roland Lebrun made a comment about Tesla debuting its robotaxi on August 8.

**13. Public Comment**

During public comment, Roland Lebrun expressed concern regarding the MTC workshop about slides not showing operating surpluses of certain entities like Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority when BART and SFMTA would face steep deficits in the near future. He asked the CAC to bring the concern to their district supervisors to take action.

**14. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.